IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THEUMOBSE PISTRICT OF ALABAMA

DEBRASOLUTION
U.S. DISTRICT
MIDDLE DIST

George Horas

Plaintiff

V

THOMAS M. GOGGANS

Defendant

Community

Communit

OBJECTION TO THE RECCOMMENDATION
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

PLAINTIFF OBJECTS THAT THE MAGISTANTE JUDGE
HAS ORDENED THAT THIS OBJECTION BE RECEIVED
BYTHE COURT ON THE 25" OF NOVEMBER 2005. THE
RECCOMMENDATION WAS RECEIVED ON 22 Nov 2005.
THIS OBJECTION WAS PREPARED ON 24 Nov 2005.
(THAMMSGUING PAY) AND THE MONTGOMERY JAH MAIL
DOES NOT RUN UNTIL 28 NOV 2005, MAKING IT
AN IMPOSSIBILITY TO FILE IN A TIMELY MANNER.
PLAINTIFF HAS FILED FOR AN EXTENTION OF TIME
SO THAT HE CAN PREPARE A MORE EFFICIENT OBJECTION.
PLAINTIFF OBJECTS THAT THE MAGISTANTE JUDGE
HAS CONCLUDED THAT THIS PLAINTIFF IS FILING
A 42U.S.C. \$1983 ACTION WHEN IN FACT THIS IS
NOT TRUE.

PAGE ONE

PLAINTIFF OBJECTS THAT THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE STATES
THAT PLAINTIFF SEEKS TO SUE HIS COUNCIL FOR RENDEMING
INNEFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNCIL DURING PRETTAIN
MOCKETINGS AND FAILS TO MENTION THAT PLAINTIFF CIMPLAINS
THAT THE DEFENDANT FILEO A MOTION TO DISMISS A
CLUR APPEAL WITHOUT THE PLAINTIFF'S KNOWLEDGE OR
PERMISSION.

PLAINTIFF OBJECTS THAT THE MADISTRATE JUDGE
13 USING THE FACT THAT THIS PLAINTIFF IS FILING
IN FORMA PAUDERLS AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISMISS
ITIS CLAIMS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 28USC. SIDIS,
To remeny THIS, PLAINTIFF HAS FILED A MOTION TO
WITHDRAW THE MOTION TO PROCEED FORMA DAUDERIS"
AND IS PAYING THE FILING FEE IN FULL.

MAINTIFF OBTECTS THAT THE MACISTRATE TUDGE HAS
NOT ADDRESSED THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANT
ALLOWED THAT A HEARING BE CALLED WITHOUT
THE RAINTIFF AND COUNCIL'S PRESENCE AND A BENCH
WARRANT ISSUED RESULTING IN PLAINTIFT'S ARREST.

PLAINTIFF OBJECTS THAT THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ITAS SUMMANUZED A 23 PARAGRAPH COMPLAINT IN

A MANNERTHAT MAKES IT APPEAR AS IF IT IS

FRIUDLOUS OR MALICIOUS WITHOUT ADDRESSING THE

ELEMENTS OF THE COMPLAINT AND INSTEAD

SUMMARIZING THE COMPLAINT AS INNEFECTIVE ASSISTANCE

OF COUNCIL DURING PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS ON

UARLOUS CRIMINAL CHARGES."

PAGE TWO

RAINTIFF ONTERES TWAT THE MAGISTANTE JUDGE FAILS TO ADDRESS THE FACT THAT THE PLAINTIFF HAS PAID \$50000 FOR FOUR CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND THAT THE DEFENDANT HAS COMPLETED ONLY ONE; AND THAT ONE WAS NOT SATISFACTORY. PLAINTIFF DOES NOT WANT THE BEFENDANT TO CONTINUE HIS REPRESENTATION AND HAS IN FACT HINER ANOTHER ATTORNEY.

PLAINTIFF SOJETTS THAT THE MAGISTRIATE JUDGE FAILER TO MENTION THAT THE DEFENDENT REFUSED TO COMMUNICATE AND FAILED TO RESPOND TO OR ANSWER MORE THAN 75 MESSIGES AND NUMEROUS WAITTEN REQUESTS FIND THAT THIS DEHAVIOR BECAME WORSE AFTER THIS PLAINTIFF WAS INCANCENATED.

PLAINTIFF ODVECTS THAT THE MAGISTILATE JUDGE DID NOT ADDRESS THE GART THAT ACCORDING TO THE TESTIMONY OF THOMES COMM IN, A FAILURE TO APPEAN WAMPANI (FOR ONE OF THE CASES FOR WHICH THIS DEFENDANT WAS HIRED) WAS IN EXISTANCE AT THE DETENTION HEARING AT WHICH THIS PLAINTIFF WAS THILED AND WAS THE Primary REMSON FOR HIS INCARCERATION. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE HAS NO JUNESDICTION

ODER SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS,

RESPECTENCY SUBMITTED ON Z4NOV 2005. Page Three

Filed 11/29/2005

Mont Somey M. Joseph Johnson M. Joseph Johnson M. Joseph Johnson M. Joseph Case 2:05-cv-01069-MHT-VPM Document 9 Page 4 of 4 2:0501069

White was actioned to the said

34101+0711



/ WITER SIMMES DISTAGE COURT PO Box 711 Montgomeny, Itc. 36101